

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims have been amended, and, thus, the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is requested.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1-2 are objected to because of informalities. Use of the word 'other' is English grammatically correct by referring to a translated word remaining from two or more translated words, as suggested by the definition of 'other.' Nevertheless, independent claims 1, 16, 19, 22 and 25 are amended to require 'another' and in case of antecedent basis to require 'the another.' Other claims are amended taking into consideration the Examiner comments. Withdrawal of the claim objections is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §102

Claims 1-12, 16-17, 19-20, 22-23, 25-26 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Koizumi et al., U.S. Publication No. 2005/0131673. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The independent claims are 1, 11, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25 and 26.

Regarding items 4 to 5 of the Office Action:

Regarding independent claims 1, 16, 19, 22 and 25, the Examiner points out that the claim language 'translated words respectively corresponding to words composing an input original sentence' correspond to Koizumi's "word candidates" in paragraph [0047] (see page 4 of the Office Action). However, Koizumi's "word candidates" are words coinciding with an input pronunciation or words similar to the input pronunciation, which may be used also as a bilingual dictionary since translated words are displayed together with word candidates. However, Koizumi's displayed 'word candidates' and displayed translations of the word candidates are not a translated sentence of the original sentence. The language of claim is amended for clarity to require **"obtaining a plurality of translated words respectively corresponding to being translation words of respective input words composing an input original sentence from a translated word dictionary file; ... translating the original sentence into a translated sentence sentence, by selecting a translated word to be used in the translated sentence from the plurality of translated words obtained by the translated word obtaining unit and combining the selected translated words."**

Further, the language of claim 1 is amended for clarity taking into consideration the Examiner claim objections to require “a translation unit ***translating the original sentence into a translated sentence-sentence, by selecting a translated word ...***; a speech recognition unit ***recognizing an input speech pronunciation and selecting ~~other~~another translated word other than the selected translated word and matching the input pronunciation, ...*** and ***outputting the ~~other~~another translated word as a result of the speech recognition***; and a correction unit ***correcting the translated sentence translated by the translation unit by using the ~~other~~another translated word output from the speech recognition unit.*** It is readily apparent Koizumi paragraphs 61-64 do not disclose expressly, or inherently by failing to necessarily require, these features of claim 1. Paragraphs 61 as well as 40 discuss providing a semantic slot in a template sentence and replacing the slot with a word, which fails to expressly, or fails to inherently by not necessarily requiring, the language of claim 1 “***recognizing an input speech pronunciation and selecting ~~other~~another translated word other than the selected translated word and matching the input pronunciation, ...*** and ... ***correcting the translated sentence translated by the translation unit by using the ~~other~~another translated word.***” So a prima facie case of anticipation based upon Koizumi cannot be established.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and allowance of claim 1 is requested.

Claims 16, 19, 22 and 25 are amended to require limitations similar to the discussed limitations of claim 1.

Regarding independent claims 11, 17, 20, 23 and 26, the Examiner points out that Koizumi discusses searching for a word and an example sentence in correspondence with the category code (paragraphs [0040] to [0042] and [0047] to [0048] (see page 9 of the Office Action). In Koizumi, however, a "place" and an "organization" are indicated as a category code. In comparison with the Examiner's opinion, a "noun" is not indicated as a category code. Although a "noun" is indicated as grammatical information 705 in Koizumi's Fig. 7, searching for a word and example sentence on the basis of the grammatical information 705 is not described expressly or inherently by Koizumi. Therefore, Koizumi fails to disclose expressly, or inherently by failing to necessarily require, the language of claim 11 "a part of speech determination unit ***determining whether a part of speech of the other translated word differs from a part of speech of the translated word to be replaced with the other translated word.***" In other words, the language of claim 11 requires “determining ... a part of speech ... differs from a part of speech of the translated word to be replaced,” which differs from Koizumi's discussion of

providing a semantic slot in a template sentence and replacing the slot with a word. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 and allowance of claim 11 is requested.

Claims 17, 20, 23 and 26 require limitations similar to the discussed limitations of claim 11.

The remaining dependent claims inherit the patentable recitations of their respective base claims, and therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited art for the reasons discussed above in addition to the additional features recited therein.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: _____ April 22, 2009 _____ By: _____
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501